	Case 1:23-cv-00526-KES-SAB Docume	nt 41 Filed 11/04/24 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	LAWRENCE CHRISTOPHER SMITH,	No. 1:23-cv-00526-KES-SAB (PC)
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
12	v.	TO STAY PROCEEDINGS
13	SECRETARY, et al.,	Doc. 37
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to	
17	42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to	
18	28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
19	On April 21, 2023, the Court screened Plaintiff's second amended complaint, found he	
20	failed to state a cognizable claim for relief, and granted Plaintiff thirty days to file a third	
21	amended complaint. Doc. 32. In lieu of filing an amended complaint, Plaintiff filed objections to	
22	the Court's April 21, 2023, screening order which the Court construed as a motion for	
23	reconsideration. Docs. 33, 34. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration was denied by the then-	
24	assigned district judge on September 18, 2023. Doc. 34. The Court's order noted that "[t]o the	
25	extent Plaintiff has presented new allegations that are not present in the second amended	
26	complaint, his remedy is to file a third amended complaint in compliance with the Court's April	
27	21, 2023, screening order, not a motion for reconsideration." Doc. 34 at 3. On September 19,	
28	2023, the Court granted plaintiff thirty days to file a third amended complaint, Doc. 35, and when	
		1

plaintiff did not file a third amended complaint by the deadline, on October 30, 2023, the Court ordered plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed within fourteen days.

Doc. 36.

On November 1, 2023, plaintiff filed a motion to stay these proceedings, pending a petition for writ of mandamus in the Supreme Court of the United States that plaintiff filed in another case. Doc. 37. Given that the Supreme Court denied plaintiff's petition, *In re Lawrence Smith*, No. 23-5850 (petition denied Jan. 8, 2024), plaintiff's motion to stay these proceedings pending the petition's outcome is denied as moot. In addition, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(b) provides that a party may stay a judgment by providing a bond or other security. Here, the record does not reflect a valid reason for a stay as no judgment has been entered and plaintiff has not provided a bond or security. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to stay the proceedings is denied.

The Court will allow plaintiff a final opportunity to file a third amended complaint in compliance with the Court's prior orders. *See* Docs. 32, 35. Any amended complaint must be filed within thirty days from the date of service of this order or this action may be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to obey court orders.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to stay the proceedings, Doc. 37, is denied;
- 2. Within thirty (30) days from the date of service of this order, plaintiff shall file a third amended complaint in compliance with the Court's April 21, 2023, screening order (Doc. 32);
- 3. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for proceedings consistent with this order.

26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 2, 2024

JNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

##